



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

P

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/250,340	02/16/1999	YIK HEI SIA	TAY-101	1943
23371	7590	05/01/2006	EXAMINER	
CROCKETT & CROCKETT 24012 CALLE DE LA PLATA SUITE 400 LAGUNA HILLS, CA 92653			KAZIMI, HANI M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3624		

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/250,340	SIA, YIK HEI
	Examiner Hani Kazimi	Art Unit 3624

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-21,23-32,35 and 37-53 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5, 7-21, 23-32, 35 and 37-53 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on October 11, 2005. The rejections cited are as stated below:

Response to Applicant's amendment

2. Applicants' amendment filed on October 11, 2005 have been fully considered, and discussed in the next section below or within the following rejections are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicants' request for allowance is respectfully denied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 1-5, 7-21, 23-32, 35 and 37-53 recites the limitation "wherein said verification failure ---". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or unobviousness.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-32, 35 and 37-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zampese (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,650).

Claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-32, 35 and 37-53, Zampese discloses a method and a corresponding system for establishing secure connections between a provider and a customer, comprising the steps of providing a memory device for storing a first set of codes, wherein the memory device can receive, store and delete sets of codes which are accessible by the customer, storing a plurality of sets of codes with the provider, wherein the plurality of sets of codes includes the first set of codes, receiving a first customer code from the customer during establishing a secure connection, the first code being selected from the first set of codes stored on the memory device, accessing a first provider code from the first set of codes stored with the provider, comparing the first customer code with the first provider code , wherein a perfect match is a successful verification, establishing a secure connection to the customer when a successful verification occurs, and preventing further use of the first customer code by the customer by deleting the first customer code and the first provider code (column 3, line

37 thru column 4, line 62).

Zampese discloses that the plurality of codes are generated by means of a pseudo random generator and a software program arranged to produce non-repeating sequence of codes (column 3, lines 45-63), each code includes a sequence of characters or numbers, wherein said characters or numbers include Roman numerals, letters of the alphabet, Morse codes (column 3, lines 46-63) and the plurality of codes are generated external to the system (column 3, lines 29-63).

Zampese discloses that the first code storage means includes one of an ATM transaction card, a smart card, an integrated circuit microchip and a computer diskette, the second code storage means is associated with one of a bank computer system, a service provider computer system and a telephone exchange (column 3, line 38 thru column 4, line 61) and at least one said part or station includes a PC or computer terminal (column 4, lines 14-40).

Zampese fails to teach that the access codes are being sent by means of an Internet download initiated by a software verification program.

Official Notice is taken that downloading access codes over the Internet is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Zampese to include that the access codes are being sent by means of an Internet download initiated by a software verification program because, it provides convenience to the user by not having to request a new code for each single transaction, and a system that is user friendly.

Zampese fails to teach that the plurality of codes are at least 100.

However, Zampese teaches the use of a plurality of codes that are generated by a computerized random number generator (column 3, lines 29-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Zampese to include that the plurality of codes are at least 100 because, it provides convenience to the user by not having to request a new code for each single transaction, and a system that is user friendly.

Zampese fails to teach that at least one said part or station includes an ATM terminal, a mobile transceiver, or a door opening apparatus.

However, the fact that the apparatus includes an ATM terminal, a mobile transceiver, or a door opening apparatus is just a field of use.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Zampese to include that the apparatus includes an ATM terminal, a mobile transceiver, or a door opening apparatus because, it provides a system that is user friendly. Also, Zampese uses this apparatus to conduct transactions over the Internet which is very similar to transactions that are conducted using an ATM or a mobile device.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-32, 35 and 37-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 3624

January 9, 2006